UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,900	09/18/2003	William F. McKay	4002-3376/PC445.00	8517
30565 7590 04/23/2007 WOODARD, EMHARDT, MORIARTY, MCNETT & HENRY LLP 111 MONUMENT CIRCLE, SUITE 3700			EXAMINER	
			PELLEGRINO, BRIAN E	
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-5137			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3738	, , ,
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	3 MONTHS 04/23/2007 PAPER		PER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/666,900	MCKAY ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
·	Brian E. Pellegrino	3738		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was a reply received by the office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 M This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro-			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 17-19,27 and 42-48 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 17-19,27 and 42-48 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) □ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) □ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11) □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11) □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11) □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11) □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11 □	wn from consideration. r election requirement. r. epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is obtains	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	·		

Application/Control Number: 10/666,900

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The indicated allowability of claims 42-48 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Lambrecht et al. 2002/151979. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 17,27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Lambrecht et al. (2002/151979). Fig. 27 shows a folded second configuration of an implanted material. Fig. 49G illustrates an intervertebral disc implant 400 having a length and first straight configuration with a drawstring 406 attached thereto for folding the implant in the disc space. Lambrecht et al. disclose the implant material can be in a woven form, paragraph 209. The examiner is interpreting the claimed elements "braided" in this way: both braided and woven are interlaced strands or filaments.

Claims in a pending application should be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. *In re Pearson*, 181 USPQ 641 (CCPA 1974). See also *In re Morris*, Fed. Cir. 1997 127 F3d 1048, 1054,1055. Figs. 50C,50D,51B,51C show the implant being pulled to a folded configuration. Lambrecht also discloses the drawstring is used to pull

Application/Control Number: 10/666,900

Art Unit: 3738

the implant to a folded configuration, paragraph 207. Lambrecht additionally disclose natural tissue material is used for the implant, paragraphs 31,32.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 42,45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambrecht et al. (2002/151979). Lambrecht et al. is explained supra. Lambrecht shows (Fig. 49G) an implant with a length greater than the width. However, Lambrecht et al. do not explicitly state the implant has a length-to-width ratio of less than 5:1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize or vary the dimensions of the implant, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable dimensions involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233. With respect to claims 45-47, it is noted that Lambrecht discloses that multiple sites on the implant can be used to pass the drawstring through, paragraph 207. However, Lambrecht does not explicitly disclose the number of sites to pass the drawstring through. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the number of sites on the implant for the drawstring, since applicant has not disclosed that using three, five or ten provide any advantage, or solve a stated problem, or are used for any particular purpose. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the multiple sites on the implant taught Application/Control Number: 10/666,900

Art Unit: 3738

by Lambrecht or the claimed three, five or ten in claim(s) 45-47 respectively because both implant devices are pulled in the same fashion with multiple drawstring locations.

Claims 18,43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambrecht et al. (2002/151979) in view of Muhanna (6936070). Lambrecht et al. is explained above. However, Lambrecht et al. fail to disclose the natural tissue is pericardium. Muhanna discloses that natural pericardium tissue can be used to form a spinal implant material, col. 4, lines 51-54. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute natural tissue and use pericardium as taught by Muhanna for the natural tissue in Lambrecht et al. spinal implant because of the abundance, availability and biocompatibility.

Claims 19,44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambrecht et al. (2002/151979) in view of Sybert et al. (2002/107570). Lambrecht et al. is explained above. However, Lambrecht et al. fail to disclose the natural tissue is SIS. Sybert et al. discloses that natural tissue (small intestine submucosa) can be used to form a prosthetic device, paragraph 31. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize SIS as taught by Sybert et al. for the natural tissue in Lambrecht et al. spinal implant because of the abundance of SIS and its durability.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17-19,27 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3738

)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian E. Pellegrino whose telephone number is 571-272-4756. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Fr (7:30am-5pm). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TC 3700, AU 3738

BRIAN E. PELLEGRINO PRIMARY EXAMINER

Brian { Pellegrin

Page 5